

7 May 1976

MEMORANDUM FOR: Chief, Regulations Control Branch

STATINTL

FROM : [REDACTED]
Chief, Review Staff, OP

SUBJECT : Proposed Revision of [REDACTED] Management of
Supergrade Personnel

STATINTL

STATINTL

1. Forwarded for coordination and publication is a proposed revision of [REDACTED] paragraphs a and b. These amendments are proposed on the basis of a memorandum from the Secretary, CIA Management Committee approved by the DDCI on 25 February 1976.

2. The draft attached hereto has been informally reviewed by the DD/A.

/S/
[REDACTED]

STATINTL

Att.

Distribution:

- Orig + 1 - Adse, w/att
- 1 - EO-DDA, w/att
- 1 - D/Pers, w/att
- 1 - OP/RS, w/att

STATINTL

OP/P&C/RS [REDACTED]:1rm (7 May 76)

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)		STATINTL		Management of Supergrade Personnel	
FROM: Chief, Review Staff, OP 626 C of C		EXTENSION 3465		NO. DATE 24 May 1976	
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)	
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED			
1 Chief, Regulations Control Branch				<p>We have reviewed your revision of our proposed regulation on super-grades, and have annotated the copy being returned with our comments. We have again revised para b(2)(a) to a version of the original. The Agency Board reviews OP's findings on the Agency-wide allocation and your version fuzzes this aspect. This is an important feature of the new approach and we feel it must be made clear. The annual review is targeted to the allocation as it exists and the position requirements which could change it.</p> <p>In para b(4)(c), please reinsert the phrase "upon receipt of supportive information." This is very important -- many requests come without justification with subsequent delay of months in providing the data and without this requirement being included in the Regulation, 14 days could come to haunt us.</p> <p>No problem with your other editing but I do note that page 1 uses "will" ...and the responsibilities are written as "is." Not sure why this strikes me, but it does. I can see it both ways . . . and only note to be sure it conforms to the current regulatory style (and not an aberration as ours often are...).</p> <div>STATINTL</div>	
2. 211 Key					
3.					
4.					
5.					
6.					
7.					
8.					
9.					
10.					
11.					
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					